

Quantum critical quasiparticle scattering within the superconducting state of CeCoIn₅

Johnpierre Paglione,^{1,2,*} M. A. Tanatar,^{3,4} J.-Ph. Reid,³ H. Shakeripour,⁵ C. Petrovic,^{2,6} and Louis Taillefer^{2,3,†}

¹*Center for Nanophysics and Advanced Materials,
Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742*

²*Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, Canada*

³*Département de physique & RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada*

⁴*Ames Laboratory, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA*

⁵*Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan 84156-83111, Iran*

⁶*Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973*

(Dated: March 8, 2016)

The thermal conductivity κ of the heavy-fermion metal CeCoIn₅ was measured in the normal and superconducting states as a function of temperature T and magnetic field H , for a current and field parallel to the [100] direction. Inside the superconducting state, when the field is lower than the upper critical field H_{c2} , κ/T is found to increase as $T \rightarrow 0$, just as in a metal and in contrast to the behavior of all known superconductors. This is due to unpaired electrons on part of the Fermi surface, which dominate the transport above a certain field. The evolution of κ/T with field reveals that the electron-electron scattering (or transport mass m^*) of those unpaired electrons diverges as $H \rightarrow H_{c2}$ from below, in the same way that it does in the normal state as $H \rightarrow H_{c2}$ from above. This shows that the unpaired electrons sense the proximity of the field-tuned quantum critical point of CeCoIn₅ at $H^* = H_{c2}$ even from inside the superconducting state. The fact that the quantum critical scattering of the unpaired electrons is much weaker than the average scattering of all electrons in the normal state reveals a k -space correlation between the strength of pairing and the strength of scattering, pointing to a common mechanism, presumably antiferromagnetic fluctuations.

PACS numbers:

With the discovery of iron-based superconductors [1], the interplay of magnetism and superconductivity has become an increasingly important topic of condensed matter physics. The archetypal evidence of magnetically-mediated superconductivity in the heavy-fermion metal CeIn₃ [2] linked unconventional Cooper pairing with magnetic fluctuations emanating from a quantum critical point (QCP), a scenario widely believed to explain the common appearance of superconductivity in the vicinity of antiferromagnetic order in heavy fermion, organic, pnictide and cuprate families of superconductors [3].

The heavy-fermion superconductor CeCoIn₅, a layered version of CeIn₃, continues to receive considerable attention [4–7] over a decade after its discovery [8]. Low-temperature transport studies of CeCoIn₅ revealed a magnetic field-tuned QCP [9], in the form of a divergent transport mass m^* , with a critical field H^* that anomalously coincides with H_{c2} , the upper critical field for superconductivity. The criticality was also detected in the specific heat, with a continuously rising on cooling γ coefficient at H^* [10] and a crossover to a Fermi-liquid saturation dependence above 8 T, significantly higher than H^* . The pinning of H^* to H_{c2} was subsequently shown to hold regardless of field orientation [11] or suppression of the superconducting state by impurities [12], suggesting a novel form of quantum criticality closely linked with the superconducting state. Recent work has revealed other examples of systems that appear to have a field-tuned QCP pinned to H_{c2} , including cuprates [13, 14] and iron pnictides [15].

The presence of a similar type of criticality in the antiferromagnet CeRhIn₅ under pressure [16] strongly suggests that the QCP in CeCoIn₅ is also magnetic in nature. Magnetic ordering inside the superconducting state was actually suggested from flux flow resistivity measurements in $H \parallel c$ configuration [17], though this conclusion does not find support in μ SR [18] or neutron scattering measurements [19] directly probing magnetic ordering. On the other hand, neutron scattering [20, 21] and NMR [22] measurements in $H \parallel ab$ find field-induced antiferromagnetism in the vicinity of H_{c2} and also suggest that magnetism evolves gradually with field increase [23, 24] leading to condensation of long range order. However, the relation between quantum criticality and superconductivity in CeCoIn₅ remains elusive, in particular since the H_{c2} transition has first-order character below $T \simeq 1$ K [25], making a connection between H_{c2} and H^* unlikely. This raises the fundamental question of whether the fluctuations associated with the field-tuned QCP in CeCoIn₅ are in any way present in the superconducting state and involved in the pairing.

In this Letter, we show that quasiparticle heat transport in the superconducting state of CeCoIn₅ reflects the same quantum critical behavior that characterizes transport in the normal state. This observation provides us with an opportunity to study the field-tuned QCP from both below and above H_{c2} . We find a similarly rapid increase of the quasiparticle mass on tuning to H_{c2} from either side, consistent with the existence of a singular and continuous critical point, despite the first-order tran-

sition. We also find a ten-fold decrease in the inelastic scattering strength upon crossing H^* into the superconducting state, providing a direct link between scattering and pairing, as the Fermi-surface regions of strongest scattering are also those that are most strongly gapped. We therefore infer that in CeCoIn₅ the fluctuations associated with the QCP, most likely antiferromagnetic, are also involved in the pairing.

High-quality single crystals of the two closely-related heavy-fermion metals CeCoIn₅ and CeIrIn₅ were grown by the self-flux method [8]. In the absence of a magnetic field, their bulk superconducting transition temperatures are $T_c = 2.3$ K and $T_c = 0.4$ K, respectively. Platelet-shaped samples with typical dimensions $\sim 2 \times 0.2 \times 0.05$ mm³ were prepared for transport measurements along the [100] direction, using the same four-wire contacts for both electrical and thermal conductivity. Thermal conductivity was measured with a one-heater, two-thermometer steady-state technique and in-situ thermometer calibration in high fields, using low-resistance indium solder contacts to avoid electron-phonon decoupling effects at low temperatures [26, 27]. The heat current was always applied along the a axis ([100] direction) of the tetragonal crystal structure. The magnetic field was aligned either along the c axis ([001] direction) or along the a axis, with a possible misalignment of less than 1°.

In Fig. 1, the thermal conductivity κ of CeCoIn₅ is plotted as κ/T vs T , for different values of the magnetic field applied along the heat current ($H \parallel a$), from $H = 0$ to $H = 17$ T. This covers the superconducting state below $H_{c2} = 12$ T and the normal state above H_{c2} .

There are two unusual features of CeCoIn₅ that must be born in mind. The first feature is the fact that CeCoIn₅ is an extreme multi-band superconductor [28], in the sense that a tiny magnetic field (of order 10 mT [29]) kills superconductivity on part of the Fermi surface, so that some of the carriers behave like normal-state quasiparticles even deep inside the superconducting state. These unpaired (uncondensed, ungapped) electrons dominate the thermal conductivity in the $T = 0$ limit, and 90% of the residual linear term κ/T at $T \rightarrow 0$ is due to them, with only some 10% coming from nodal quasiparticles [28]. At intermediate temperatures, nodal quasiparticles become thermally excited and cause a peak in κ/T vs T (Fig. 1a). However, applying a magnetic field introduces vortices that scatter these nodal quasiparticles and suppresses their contribution to κ at all temperatures. As a result, for $H > 4$ T, $\kappa(T)$ is purely metallic-like, completely dominated by the unpaired electrons. Indeed, as seen in Fig. 1b, all curves with 4 T $< H < H_{c2}$ show Fermi-liquid behavior at low temperature.

The second unusual feature of CeCoIn₅ is the fact that the transition out of the vortex state, from $H < H_{c2}$ to $H > H_{c2}$, is a pronounced first-order transition [25]. This




FIG. 1: In-plane thermal conductivity of CeCoIn₅ for $H \parallel a$, plotted as κ/T vs T . (a) For $H < 5$ T, as indicated. (b) For $5 \text{ T} < H < H_{c2}$, as indicated. *Inset*: field dependence of κ/T at $T = 70$ mK, showing the sharp first-order transition at $H_{c2} = 12$ T. The transition is also detected as a function of temperature, in the data at $H = 11.5$ T (red arrow, main panel). (c) For $H > H_{c2}$, in the normal state. The blue dashed lines in panels b) and c) are a fit of the data at $H = 10$ T and $H = 17$ T, respectively, to the Fermi-liquid expression, $\kappa/T = L_0/(w_0 + BT^2)$, where $L_0 \equiv (\pi^2/3)(k_B/e)^2$.

is readily seen in a field sweep at low temperature, as shown in the inset of Fig. 1b, where $\kappa(H)$ undergoes a sudden jump at $H_{c2} = 12$ T.

In order to better understand the unusual data on CeCoIn₅, it is helpful to compare with more conventional behavior. For this we turn to the closely-related superconductor CeIrIn₅. Unlike in CeCoIn₅ there is no field-tuned QCP in CeIrIn₅ [30], nor is there any evidence of a very small gap on part of its Fermi surface (hence no unpaired electrons at low field), nor is there any first-order transition. In Fig. 2a, we show the thermal conductivity of CeIrIn₅, plotted as κ/T vs T [31, 32]. As in CeCoIn₅, the thermal conductivity of CeIrIn₅ is purely electronic, with negligible phonon contribution [27, 30–34]. In the normal state, when $H = H_{c2} = 0.5$ T or greater, κ/T has the standard dependence of a Fermi liquid, namely a thermal resistivity $w \equiv L_0 T/\kappa = w_0 + BT^2$, where $L_0 \equiv (\pi^2/3)(k_B/e)^2$. At $H = 0$, κ/T drops below T_c , and decreases monotonically to reach a non-zero residual




FIG. 2: (a) Thermal conductivity of CeIrIn₅, plotted as κ/T vs T , for different values of the magnetic field as indicated, for $H \parallel c$. For $H = H_{c2}$ (0.5 T), $\kappa/T = L_0/(w_0 + BT^2)$, as expected of a Fermi liquid (dotted line). For $H < H_{c2}$ (0.2 and 0.4 T), κ/T decreases monotonically as $T \rightarrow 0$, as found in most superconductors. (b) Thermal conductivity of CeCoIn₅ in the superconducting (blue, $H = 11.5$ T) and normal (red, $H = 13$ T) states, for $H \parallel a$. In the normal state, κ/T rises rapidly as $T \rightarrow 0$, a signature of the QCP at $H^* = 12$ T, with a Fermi-liquid regime observed only below 0.2 K. In the superconducting state, κ/T rises as $T \rightarrow 0$, in stark contrast to the conventional behavior of CeIrIn₅. The conductivity mimics the behaviour of the normal state, showing that quantum criticality persists below H_{c2} . The dotted line shows a fit to the Fermi-liquid function $L_0/(w_0 + BT^2)$. (c) Same as panel (b), but for $H \parallel c$, where $H^* = 5$ T.

value at $T = 0$ [31, 32], the signature of nodes in the superconducting gap [35]. The drop is simply due to a loss of thermally excited quasiparticles [36]. It is in part compensated by a concomitant loss of electron-electron inelastic scattering, but in CeIrIn₅, this compensating effect is small, since the strength of inelastic scattering at T_c is only of order the elastic scattering, *i.e.* $BT_c^2 \simeq w_0$ [31, 32]. At intermediate fields ($0 < H < H_{c2}$), κ/T continues to drop as $T \rightarrow 0$ (Fig. 2a), again due to a loss of quasiparticle density. The magnetic field also excites quasiparticles [37], in particular nodal quasiparticles at $T = 0$, and hence increases κ/T [35].

As seen in Figs. 2b and 2c, the situation in CeCoIn₅ is very different. Here the inelastic scattering in the normal state is extremely strong, especially near the QCP, at $H^* = 5$ T for $H \parallel c$ and $H^* = 12$ T for $H \parallel a$. For $H \parallel a$ (Fig. 2b), κ/T undergoes a ten-fold drop between $T = 0$ and $T = 0.6$ K, in the normal state at $H = 13$ T. In the superconducting state at $H = 0$ (Fig. 1a), κ/T rises rapidly upon cooling below T_c [28, 38], because initially the loss of inelastic scattering more than compensates for the loss of quasiparticles. But eventually, at low temperature, κ/T falls because of the decreasing quasiparticle density.

The resulting peak in κ/T vs T below T_c is rapidly suppressed by a magnetic field (Fig. 1a). Above a cer-




FIG. 3: In-plane thermal resistivity of CeCoIn₅, defined as $w \equiv L_0 T / \kappa$ and plotted vs T^2 , for $H \parallel a$. (a) For $H > H_{c2}$, in the normal state. (b) For $H < H_{c2}$, in the superconducting state. The solid lines are a fit of the data to the Fermi-liquid expression $w(T) = w_0 + BT^2$, where w_0 is the residual resistivity due to elastic scattering and B is the strength of the inelastic electron-electron scattering. The fits are limited to an interval between $T = 0$ and $T = T_{FL}$ (arrow). The fit parameters w_0 , B and T_{FL} are plotted in Fig. 4.

tain field, namely when $H > 4$ T for $H \parallel a$, the fall at low temperature is no longer observed (Fig. 1). As seen in Fig. 2b, at $H = 11.5$ T $< H_{c2}$, κ/T shows no drop whatsoever as $T \rightarrow 0$. On the contrary, it exhibits the same T dependence as the normal state, namely a Fermi-liquid behavior below 0.2 K, where $\kappa/T = L_0/(w_0 + BT^2)$. This means that the heat carriers are not thermally excited, but simply unpaired (not gapped). Thanks to those unpaired electrons, the normal-state behavior of at least part of the Fermi surface can be studied *inside* the superconducting state, *below* the field-tuned QCP at H^* .

In Fig. 3, the thermal resistivity $w(T)$ of CeCoIn₅ is plotted as a function of T^2 for fields below and above H_{c2} . At all fields, the data at the lowest temperatures are well described by $w(T) = w_0 + BT^2$. This is the standard Fermi-liquid behavior, the sum of a residual term w_0 controlled by the strength of elastic scattering and an inelastic term due to electron-electron scattering whose strength is given by B . Note that the extent of the T^2 regime, ending at $T = T_{FL}$, changes as a function of field. In Fig. 4, we plot w_0 , B and T_{FL} vs H .

Let us first discuss the normal state, for $H > H_{c2}$. In Fermi-liquid theory, the T^2 coefficient in the thermal resistivity $w(T)$ is proportional to the coefficient A in




FIG. 4: Parameters obtained from a fit of the thermal resistivity $w(T)$ of CeCoIn_5 to the Fermi-liquid expression $w(T) = w_0 + BT^2$, as a function of magnetic field ($H \parallel a$). The same fitting procedure, shown in Fig. 3, is applied above $H_{c2} = 12$ T (vertical dashed line) and below H_{c2} . (a) Parameters w_0 (blue triangles, left axis), the residual thermal resistivity due to elastic scattering, and B (red circles, right axis), due to inelastic electron-electron scattering, for both $H < H_{c2}$ (full symbols) and $H > H_{c2}$ (open symbols). (b) Temperature T_{FL} (black squares, left axis), the upper limit of the fitting interval (see Fig. 3). Ratio B/w_0 (red diamonds, right axis), a measure of the strength of inelastic electron-electron scattering relative to the strength of elastic scattering, for both $H < H_{c2}$ (full diamonds) and $H > H_{c2}$ (open diamonds). We see that B/w_0 undergoes a ten-fold drop upon entry into the superconducting state. All lines are a guide to the eye.

the electrical resistivity $\rho(T) = \rho_0 + AT^2$, and typically $B \simeq 2A$ [39]. (Note that the Wiedemann-Franz law requires that $w_0 = \rho_0$, as observed [33].) Both A and B are related to the effective mass of the electrons, and $A \sim B \sim (m^*)^2$. The rapid rise of B on approaching H^* from above (Fig. 4) is a signature of the field-tuned QCP, analogous to the rise of the A coefficient of the resistivity for $H \parallel a$ [11]. (Note, that $A(H)$ dependence in our measurements matches very well with previous studies [11].) This rise is expected to follow $(H - H_c^*)^{-1}$ dependence in the local criticality scenario, in which fluctuations affect the entire Fermi surface [40]. The dependence becomes milder for spin density wave model of quantum criticality, with only hot spots affected by fluctuations [41, 42]. The same parallel rise of A and B was previously reported for CeCoIn_5 in configuration $H \parallel c$ [33]. Nevertheless, the $A(H)$ (and similarly $B(H)$)

dependence does not follow expectation of any theory, with specific heat, $\gamma(T) \equiv C/T$ revealing downward deviation from logarithmic divergence and simultaneous directional Wiedemann-Franz law violation for $H < 8$ T [10, 27]. The fact that the residual resistivity w_0 is independent of H (Fig. 4) simply means that there is negligible magnetoresistance, not surprisingly given the longitudinal configuration where current and field are parallel.

Let us now turn to the superconducting state, with $H < H_{c2}$. The fact that w_0 is still nearly independent of H (Fig. 4a) is consistent with our interpretation that heat transport below H_{c2} is dominated by unpaired electrons that show metallic-like behavior, again with negligible magnetoresistance, at least for $H > 4$ T. It is interesting to compare CeCoIn_5 with the classic multi-band superconductor MgB_2 . In MgB_2 , application of a moderate field in the plane easily kills superconductivity on the quasi-3D π Fermi surface where the gap is small, driving it into a gapless regime [43], but it has little effect in exciting quasiparticles on the quasi-2D σ Fermi surface where the gap is large [44]. As a result, for $H \perp c$, κ/T vs H is nearly independent of H above $H_{c2}/10$ or so and entirely due to the unpaired electrons on the π surface for a wide range of fields. In other words, just as in CeCoIn_5 , the unpaired electrons in MgB_2 completely dominate κ inside the superconducting state and allow one to probe the metallic state below H_{c2} .

We can now study the inelastic scattering experienced by the unpaired electrons below H_{c2} . Our main finding is that B rises rapidly upon approaching H_{c2} from below (Fig. 4a). This provides direct evidence for the continuous nature of the field-tuned QCP in CeCoIn_5 , confirming that it survives the first-order superconducting transition. The unpaired electrons in the superconducting state clearly sense the presence of a QCP at $H = H^*$, with $H^* \simeq H_{c2}$. This is reminiscent of the mass divergence observed inside the superconducting state in the iron arsenide $\text{BaFe}_2(\text{As}_{1-x}\text{P}_x)_2$ on both sides of the antiferromagnetic QCP [45].

It is instructive to compare the strength of inelastic scattering on either side of H^* . In order to do this, we must first account for the large drop in carrier density as H crosses below H_{c2} . A measure of this is provided by w_0 , seen to be constant on either side of H_{c2} , but a factor 6 larger below H_{c2} (Fig. 4a). We infer that the carrier density (or spectral weight) of the unpaired electrons below H_{c2} is 6 times lower than that of the full Fermi surface above H_{c2} . We therefore plot the ratio B/w_0 in Fig. 4b, as the meaningful measure of the strength of inelastic scattering. We see that upon crossing below H_{c2} , B/w_0 drops abruptly by a factor 10. In other words, the unpaired electrons that prevail in the superconducting state experience a scattering that is 10 times weaker than the average electron in the normal state just above H_{c2} . This reveals a powerful correlation between scattering and pairing: those regions of the Fermi surface that

experience a dramatically weaker inelastic scattering are the same that end up having the smallest gap. This observation suggests that most heavy carriers belonging to α and β sheets of the Fermi surface [46, 47] are most important for superconductivity, in accordance with the conclusion from STS measurements [4].

We conclude that the fluctuations associated with the QCP are responsible not only for scattering the electrons above and below H_{c2} , but also for pairing these electrons, in what must be a strongly k -dependent fashion. This is reminiscent of the correlation between quantum critical scattering and pairing reported in organic [48], pnictide [48] and cuprate superconductors [3, 49], whereby the strength of the linear- T resistivity scales with T_c .

Moreover, in the single-band overdoped cuprate Tl-2201, the inelastic scattering was shown to be strongest in the same k -space regions where the d -wave gap is maximal [50]. Similar ideas are discussed recently in relation to all unconventional superconductors [51, 52].

This work was supported by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research and a Canada Research Chair (L.T.), and funded by NSERC, FRQNT and CFI. Work at the University of Maryland was supported by NSF-CAREER Grant No. DMR-0952716. Part of the work was carried out at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, which is operated for the US Department of Energy by Brookhaven Science Associates (DE-Ac02-98CH10886) and in the Ames Laboratory, supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering, under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358.

* Electronic address: paglione@umd.edu

† Electronic address: Louis.Taillefer@USherbrooke.ca

- [1] J. Paglione and R. L. Greene, Nat. Phys. **6**, 645 (2010).
- [2] N. D. Mathur, F. M. Grosche, S. R. Julian, I. R. Walker, D. M. Freye, R. K. W. Haselwimmer, and G. G. Lonzarich, Nature **394**, 39 (1998).
- [3] L. Taillefer, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **1**, 51 (2010).
- [4] M. P. Allan *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **9**, 468 (2013).
- [5] B. B. Zhou *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **9**, 474 (2013).
- [6] Y. Tokiwa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 107003 (2013).
- [7] L. Howald *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 017005 (2013).
- [8] C. Petrovic, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, Z. Fisk, and P. Monthoux, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, L337 (2001).
- [9] J. Paglione, M. A. Tanatar, D. G. Hawthorn, E. Boaknin, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, C. Petrovic, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 246405 (2003).
- [10] A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, I. Vekhter, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 257001 (2003).
- [11] F. Ronning, C. Capan, A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, A. Lacerda, M. F. Hundley, J. D. Thompson, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 104528 (2003).
- [12] E. D. Bauer, C. Capan, F. Ronning, R. Movshovich, J. D. Thompson, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 047001 (2005).
- [13] T. Shibauchi *et al.*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **105**, 7120 (2008).
- [14] N. P. Butch, K. Jin, K. Kirshenbaum, R. L. Greene, and J. Paglione, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **109**, 8440 (2012).
- [15] J. K. Dong, S. Y. Zhou, T. Y. Guan, H. Zhang, Y. F. Dai, X. Qiu, X. F. Wang, Y. He, X. H. Chen, and S. Y. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 087005 (2010).
- [16] T. Park, Y. Tokiwa, F. Ronning, H. Lee, E. D. Bauer, R. Movshovich and J. D. Thompson, Phys. Status Solidi B **247**, 553 (2010).
- [17] T. Hu, H. Xiao, T. A. Sayles, M. Dzero, M. B. Maple, and C. C. Almasan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 056401 (2012).
- [18] J. Spehling, R. H. Heffner, J. E. Sonier, N. Curro, C. H. Wang, B. Hitti, G. Morris, E. D. Bauer, J. L. Sarrao, F. J. Litterst, and H.-H. Klauss Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 237003 (2009).
- [19] A. Bianchi *et al.*, Science **319**, 177 (2008).
- [20] M. Kenzelmann, Th. Strassle, C. Niedermayer, M. Sigrist, B. Padmanabhan, M. Zolliker, A. D. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, E. D. Bauer, J. L. Sarrao, and J. D. Thompson, Science **321**, 1652 (2008).
- [21] P. Das, J. S. White, A. T. Holmes, S. Gerber, E. M. Forgan, A. D. Bianchi, M. Kenzelmann, M. Zolliker, J. L. Gavilano, E. D. Bauer, J. L. Sarrao, C. Petrovic, and M. R. Eskildsen Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 087002 (2012).
- [22] B.-L. Young, R. R. Urbano, N. J. Curro, J. D. Thompson, J. L. Sarrao, A. B. Vorontsov, and M. J. Graf Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 036402 (2007).
- [23] C. Stock, C. Broholm, Y. Zhao, F. Demmel, H. J. Kang, K. C. Rule, and C. Petrovic Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 167207 (2012).
- [24] S. Raymond and G. Lapertot Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 037001 (2015).
- [25] A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, N. Oeschler, P. Gegenwart, F. Steglich, J. D. Thompson, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 137002 (2002).
- [26] M. Smith, J. Paglione, M. B. Walker, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 014506 (2005).
- [27] M. A. Tanatar, J. Paglione, C. Petrovic, and L. Taillefer, Science **316**, 1320 (2007).
- [28] M. A. Tanatar, J. Paglione, S. Nakatsuji, D. G. Hawthorn, E. Boaknin, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, C. Petrovic, P. C. Canfield, and Z. Fisk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 067002 (2005).
- [29] G. Seyfarth, J. P. Brison, G. Knebel, D. Aoki, G. Lapertot, and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 046401 (2008).
- [30] H. Shakeripour, M. A. Tanatar, C. Petrovic, and Louis Taillefer Phys. Rev. B **93**, 075116 (2016).
- [31] H. Shakeripour, M. A. Tanatar, S. Y. Li, C. Petrovic, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 187004 (2007).
- [32] H. Shakeripour, M. A. Tanatar, C. Petrovic, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 184531 (2010).
- [33] J. Paglione, M. A. Tanatar, D. G. Hawthorn, F. Ronning, R. W. Hill, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, and C. Petrovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 106606 (2006).
- [34] Y. Kasahara, Y. Nakajima, K. Izawa, Y. Matsuda, K. Behnia, H. Shishido, R. Settai, and Y. Onuki, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 214515 (2005).

- [35] H. Shakeripour, C. Petrovic, and L. Taillefer, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 055065 (2009).
- [36] M. J. Graf, S.-K. Yip, J. A. Sauls, and D. Rainer, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 15147 (1996).
- [37] I. Vekhter and A. Houghton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4626 (1999).
- [38] R. Movshovich, M. Jaime, J. D. Thompson, C. Petrovic, Z. Fisk, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5152 (2001).
- [39] J. Paglione, M. A. Tanatar, D. G. Hawthorn, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, C. Petrovic, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 216602 (2005).
- [40] Q. M. Si, S. Rabello, K. Ingersent, J. L. Smith, *Nature* **413**, 804 (2001).
- [41] John A. Hertz *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 1165 (1976).
- [42] A. J. Millis *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 7183 (1993).
- [43] V. Barzykin and L.P. Gorkov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 087004 (2007).
- [44] A. V. Sologubenko *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 014504 (2002).
- [45] K. Hashimoto *et al.*, *Science* **336**, 1554 (2012).
- [46] R. Settai *et al.*, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **13**, L627 (2001).
- [47] A. McCollam, S. R. Julian, P. M. C. Rourke, D. Aoki, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 186401 (2005).
- [48] N. Doiron-Leyraud *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 214531 (2009).
- [49] K. Jin, N. P. Butch, K. Kirshenbaum, J. Paglione, and R. L. Greene, *Nature* **476**, 73 (2011).
- [50] M. Abdel-Jawad *et al.*, *Nat. Phys.* **2**, 821 (2006).
- [51] J. C. Davis and D.-H. Lee, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 17623 (2013).
- [52] Jianping Hu, Hong Ding, *Scientific Reports*, **2**, 381 (2012).